DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 068 444 SP 005 898

TITLE	Redeployment of the School Staff to Expedite the Teaching-Learning Process in the Lower and Middle School. Title III Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	Surry County Board of Education, Dobson, N.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-DPSC67-3650
PUB DATE	Jul 69
GRANT	OEG-3-7-673650-4413
NOTE	44p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum Development; Educational Programs; Evaluation; Inservice Education; Learning Processes; *Nongraded Classes; *Nongraded Primary System; *Program Content; *Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Teaching Procedures

ABSTRACT

Evaluation of this ESEA Title III project was based on four procedures: parent evaluation, student evaluation, teacher evaluation, and evaluation of a report by the visiting committee from the state department of public instruction. Two elementary schools in Surry County, North Carolina, have been operating under the Title III Grant since its inception. Prior to the opening of school in the fall of 1968, a one-week, in-service program was held for all teachers involved in the project. Teachers were assigned in teams of three or four with the service of an aide. The group was responsible for the total instruction of all children assigned to the team. Different methods of assigning students to groups were used, including years in school and achievement levels. Consultant assistance was used on a limited scale. The source of ideas came from teachers, principals, or supervisors. Both school projects are described in detail, including goals, organization, curriculum plans, grouping, materials, visitors, and evaluative reactions. (MJM)

ED 068444

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SURRY COUNTY SCHOOLS

DOBSON, NORTH CAROLINA

DPSC

Project No. 67-3650

Grant No. OEG-3-7-673650-4413

Evaluation of Project Entitled

"Redeployment of the School Staff to Expedite the Teaching-Learning Process in the Lower and Middle School"

July 1, 1969

SP 003 898

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Surry County Schools
Dobson, North Carolina

Evaluation of ESEA Title III Project Entitled "Redeployment of the School Staff to Expedite the Teaching-Learning Process in the Lower and Middle School" for the 1968-69 School Year.

Introduction

Development of the Title III Project was started in the fall of 1966 and was submitted to the Title III Office in Raleigh and Washington on January 1, 1967. An Approval in the amount of $92,801.00 was granted on June 19, 1967 for the 1967-68 school year. A continuation grant of $95,000.00 was received on June 19, 1968 for the 1968-69 school year.

Two schools, Franklin and Pilot Mountain Elementary have been operating under the Title III Grant since its inception. There are differences in the organizational patterns at each school. These differences can be attributed to different capabilities of teachers, different philosophy of the schools, different physical facilities, and community readiness for certain activities. Both schools are attempting to achieve the same general objectives at the end of the three-year-period, An Individualized Instructional Program for all Children.

Evaluation Procedures

1. Parent Evaluation

   Parents would be solicited for their reactions to the project in terms of likes, dislikes, and suggestions for change.

2. Student Evaluation

   Students in the fourth or fifth year to react to the above three areas; likes, dislikes, and suggestions for change.

3. Teachers will evaluate the project in teams this year. It is suggested that the same teachers continue in the team for evaluation that work together during the school year.

   Teachers used the following as a guide in their evaluation;

(a) Team-teaching and team-work that included all phases of the school program.

(b) The use of aides as a member of the team.

(c) Methods used to free children for planning time and study of individual children's records.

(d) Visitation to other schools and projects.

(e) Visitation from other teachers.

(f) Use of consultants and in-service courses.

(g) Use of additional materials.

(h) Achievement in areas that are not measured by the California Achievement Test.

(i) Changes in children's attitudes toward school.

4. The report of the visiting committee from the State Department of Public Instruction will be used for evaluation and no additional consultants will be employed for evaluation purposes. At the printing of this evaluation; however, we have not received copies of the State Department Evaluation. When this evaluation is received we will promptly file it with the appropriate agencies.

Project Objectives

Six objectives were established under the project with major emphasis to be on two specific areas. The two objectives to receive major attention are:

1. To establish and operate two model ungraded schools in grades one through four with emphasis on team-teaching, team-planning, and team evaluation, and to study the assignment of personnel in the middle grades.

2. To free teachers during the school day for planning time to study new ways to understand children, appraise their needs, and to individualize the instructional program to meet these needs.

The other objectives are by-products of the two principal objectives.

Procedures

Prior to the opening of school in the fall of 1968, a one week in-service program was held for all teachers involved in the project. The five days were devoted to the following areas: history of ungraded and team-teaching, orientation to Surry County's project, discussion of materials to be used, different methods of organization, individual school organization, meeting together of different teams, study of children's records, sequence of instruction, assignment of staff, and procedures for evaluation.

Teachers were assigned in teams of three or four with the service of an aide. The group was responsible for the total instruction of all children assigned to the team. Different methods of assigning students to groups were used. The two primary areas were years in school and achievement levels.

Consultant assistance was used on a limited scale. The source of ideas, in most instances, came from the teachers, principals, or supervisors through sharing with each other. Visitations to other schools and projects were extremely beneficial in stimulating discussion and implementing new classroom instructional ideas.

Franklin Elementary School Project

INTRODUCTION

Franklin School has completed its second year of participation in the Title III Program. The teaching staff and the administrative staff feel that it has been a good year; a year in which we built upon the foundation or the background of the first year. We will discuss our changes which, we think, are steps of improvements later in the report.

We have received a lot of help from our county administrative office in charting our course and encouraging us to take additional steps toward the team-teaching and ungraded program. Mr. Sam Gentry, our County Superintendent, has encouraged us in his staff meetings and was always cooperative in securing equipment and supplies. Dr. W. Swanson Richards, Associate Superintendent and Program Director, and Mrs. Eva Hine, General Supervisor, has helped us in planning and directing the program. We would like to express our sincere appreciation to the county staff for their wonderful support.

As we review our program and take a look at our original goals, we are pleased to note that considerable progress has been made toward reaching our objectives.

Goals or Objectives

1. To establish an ungraded school in grades one through four with emphasis on team-planning, team-teaching, and team-evaluation; and to study the assignment of professional personnel in the middle grades.

2. To better serve the needs of the socio-economic structure through school reorganization where children will have an opportunity to interact with larger numbers of children and more than one teacher.

3. To study the function and assignment of the principal, teacher, teacher aide, college consultant, and other resource persons in the lower and middle school. Special consideration will be given to the teacher aide as a member of the team.

4. To test the effectiveness of team-teaching, team-evaluation, and elimination of grades as a means of improving the educational and cultural level of children with different types of socio-economic backgrounds in a rural setting.

5. To utilize the talents and personalities of teachers, to improve the instructional program, and to improve areas where teachers indicate inadequacies. Teachers who have special talents will have an opportunity to provide instruction to larger numbers of children in these areas and assist other teachers to gain more proficiency.

6. To free teachers for planning time to study new ways to better understand children, more effectively appraise their needs, and to individualize the instructional program to meet these needs and the aspirations of children.

We hope the reader of this report will take note of these excellent goals and will observe the efforts that are being made to realize these objectives.

Organization

Our instructional staff was organized into teams. Most of the teams consisted of three teachers and one teacher aide. One teacher was designated as the team leader. Teams were organized according to the strength of the teachers. Each team was assigned approximately ninety children which were divided into groups according to their ability, and taught language arts and mathematics on their own achievement level. Other subjects were taught in homerooms to heterogeneous groups.

We had three areas of team-teaching where two teachers worked together in the same classroom space. This was a multi-age and multi-graded situation. Children who were six, seven, and eight years of age were placed in these rooms and were given mostly individualized instruction by the teacher and allowed to work on an individualized basis.

We experimented with large group instruction. Public school music was taught to large groups of ninety to one-hundred pupils. We also had social studies taught to pupils in large groups. We feel that this was successful because we had strong teachers in the field, and this large group instruction by these strong instructors supplemented the regular classroom teachers in these fields of learning.

We were fortunate to have a reading center. We had two teachers that worked with pupils who were having reading problems. The classroom teacher would send individuals or small groups for remedial reading work to the center. This has

improved the reading of many of our poor readers. We also had a classroom library in each homeroom. Many paperback books, hardback books, and supplementary readers made up the room library. These books were selected on many reading levels. Some were easy reading and some were more difficult. The pupils were given a period each day to select books of their own choosing. This increased their desire to read. They read books that were interesting to them and that they were capable of reading. We found that in choosing their own books, the children explored the library and studied the books carefully before making a decision as to which one to check out. The students used this individualized library procedure as a step to assuming more responsibility for their own education. One of our objectives is for the children to feel that they are responsible for their own education. We hope to have in our plans for next year more opportunity for the student to make decisions on his own and for the teacher to give assistance when needed. A schedule of our curriculum plans is as follows:

Curriculum Plans for Primary School

INFORMATIONAL FACTS

4 Buildings

A. Primary (12 classrooms)

B. Elementary (9 classrooms)

C. Junior High (5 classrooms)

Personnel

A. 28 Teachers in classrooms

B. 2 Reading Teachers

C. 1 Public School Music Teacher

D. 1 Librarian

E. 9 Aides

Students

A. 860 Students

ORGANIZATION

A. There are ten teams organized to work with the children ages 6 through 12.

Team 1A	3 teachers	6 and 7 year-olds
Team 1B	3 teachers	6, 7 and 8 year-olds
Team 1C	2 teachers	6, 7 and 8 year-olds
Team 11A	3 teachers	7 and 8 year-olds
Team 11B	3 teachers	7, 8 and 9 year-olds
Team 111A	3 teachers	8 and 9 year-olds
Team 111B	2 teachers	8, 9 and 10 year-olds
Team IV	4 teachers	9 and 10 year-olds
Team VA	2 teachers	10, 11 and 12 year-olds
Team VB	3 teachers	10, 11 and 12 year-olds

2 Reading Teachers
One works with Teams IA, IB, IIA, and IIB
One works with Teams IIIA, IV, VA, and VB

B. Each team has a team leader and a teacher aide.

C. Teams are organized according to strength of each teacher.

PLAN

1. Tests were given to each child, and a teacher's evaluation of each child was made to determine the range of ability for placement by the respective team.

2. Each student will be grouped for language arts and arithmetic instruction so that he may work according to his own ability.

3. Continuous evaluation of the plans is made to strengthen the weak points and make needed improvements.

GROUPING

1. Homeroom grouping instruction - 30 per room
2. Ability range grouping instruction (Language Arts and Arithmetic) - 30 per room
3. Small group instruction - 5 and 10 group
4. Large group instruction - 90 per group

Materials and Equipment

We have been very fortunate to have added to our materials and equipment list many books, recordings, listening centers, and projectors. These materials and equipment have been placed where the children can use them individually. This has greatly benefited the slow student, as well as the talented ones.

Visitations

Our teachers visited other schools that were experimenting in different programs. Some of the schools visited were:

The Model School - Greensboro, North Carolina

Elon College Elementary School - Elon College, North Carolina

Green Valley School - Roanoke, Virginia

Academy Street School - Salem, Virginia

Fairfax County School - Fairfax, Virginia

Teachers greatly enjoyed their visits to other schools, and in every case would return to school and report at staff meetings the strong practices that they saw and would like to try in their own teamwork. The weaknesses observed were also discussed. Thus the visits were beneficial, not only to the teachers doing the visiting, but also to the entire faculty who received many helpful suggestions.

Franklin School has been visited by approximately one-hundred and fifty educators this school year. Among them were superintendents, supervisors, directors of projects, principals, and teachers. We were also visited by a team from the State Department of Public Instruction at Raleigh, North Carolina. When our visitors arrived, first on the agenda, we explained the organization of our program. The team coordinator then gave them a guided tour to observe the classrooms. The visit was concluded with an oral evaluation or discussion of things they liked or disliked. Any suggestions offered for the betterment of our program were welcomed. We felt that these visits and evaluations of each other were very helpful to our teachers and our school.

The Carroll County School System was very impressed with our new program. During the year, they visited us more than any other county school system. A two-day workshop was planned for all the teachers in Carroll County to study the ungraded, team-teaching method of instructing children. The Principal of Franklin School, Mr. James C. Hiatt, and the Franklin School Coordinator, Mrs. Grace H. Laughridge, were invited as consultants to take part in the workshop. Steps taken at Franklin School to individualize instruction were discussed at the meeting. A copy of their evaluation of our program is as follows:

CARROLL COUNTY CURRICULUM STUDY AND REVISION

TITLE III

HILLSVILLE, VIRGINIA

May 26, 1969

Mr. J. C. Hiatt
Principal
Franklin Elementary School
Mount Airy, North Carolina

Dear Mr. Hiatt:

One of the highly significant activities engaged in this year by Carroll County School personnel has been our associations with Franklin School; its program and staff.

During our eight visits to your school, thirty-six of our professional staff have had opportunities to observe your teachers and pupils at work in innovative endeavors.

We can see many signs that stimulation received in your school has resulted in modifications of teaching and administrative procedures in our county.

It is anticipated that we will become more deeply involved in unique staff utilization and pupil deployment as a result of stimulus provided by your school.

Please permit me to thank you again for inviting us to your spring workshop in Pilot Mountain.

I am enclosing a brochure which describes our computer-assisted math course which we have under way.

Yours truly,

Owen Bowman
Language Arts Coordinator

OB/blj

Enclosure

We sent out five-hundred and fifty evaluation sheets to parents of children that were enrolled in the Title III Project of team-teaching. We asked them to express themselves concerning the program. A space was provided on the questionnaire for any good points, bad points or other comments they wished to make. Four-hundred and eighty-two of the questionnaires were returned. Four-hundred and sixty-four were checked favorable, and eighteen were negative. Approximately ninety-six percent of the parents were pleased with our team teaching, ungraded program that we are conducting under the Title III Project. Following are some of the parents' favorable comments concerning the program.

"Team-teaching, ungraded program is O. K."

"The team-teaching program is wonderful".

"It is more interesting for the children."

"Children learn at own rate of ability."

"Children make more decisions."

"The school day is not boring."

"I hope the program continues."

Most all the reaction that was unfavorable was concerning the type of report card we used.

"We do not like the report card."

"Why not give A, B, and C grades."

"Too much homework given by different teachers."

A copy of some of the questionnaires that were submitted by professionally trained parents are as follows:

COPY

FRANKLIN SCHOOL

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Simmons :

Your child has been enrolled in our experimental "Ungraded" and team-teaching project this year. We would appreciate your reactions to this type of program.

J. C. Hiatt, Principal

Good Points:

We feel that we are very fortunate that there is this type of program available to our children. We are proud of the progress Suzanne and Johnny have made and feel that this program is responsible for a lot of it. We feel that they are far ahead of where they would have been in a regular program or in another school where children did not have the opportunity to take advantage of this method of teaching. In observing children from other schools on the same grade levels, I can certainly tell a difference.

Since each child is taught at his or her own speed, they are not pushed to keep up with others or held back because of others. I know this has given my children confidence in themselves and their ability to progress. I do not hear them comparing their progress with that of their classmates.

Bad Points:

Comments:

Signed Mr. & Mrs. J. R. Simmons

COPY

FRANKLIN SCHOOL

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Beamer :

Your child has been enrolled in our experimental "Ungraded" and team teaching project this year. We would appreciate your reactions to this type of program.

J. C. Hiatt, Principal

Good Points:

I feel that the ungraded program has made each child feel that he is an individual who has accomplished, even though he isn't the top student in the class. He has had individual attention and worked at a rate of speed that suited the child and not the class. He hasn't been under pressure to the extent that he has become bored or dissatisfied. Being able to plan with the teacher and to make more decisions of his own, the child has a more pleasant attitude not only toward school, but life itself.

Bad Points:

The only bad point would be if the program was not continued.

Comments:

Signed Louise B. Beamer

COPY

FRANKLIN SCHOOL

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Lowe :

Your child has been enrolled in our experimental "Ungraded" and team teaching project this year. We would appreciate your reactions to this type of program.

J. C. Hiatt, Principal

Good Points:

The children seem to enjoy their work so much. I don't believe they get bored as they often do in the conventional type of classroom. Holly seems to make more progress under this system.

Bad Points:

I wonder about the reaction when these children go back to the tranditional situation. Holly appears to be doing all right without working for grades. Do all children? If so, this is an excellent point in favor of the ungraded system.

Comments:

When brakes are applied and these free-wheeling pupils are held to a grade level, there may be trouble. School may cease to be an adventure.

Signed Vivian H. Lowe

COPY

FRANKLIN SCHOOL

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Jordan :

Your child has been enrolled in our experimental "Ungraded" and team-teaching project this year. We would appreciate your reactions to this type of program.

J. C. Hiatt, Principal

Good Points:

Our son was almost seven when he entered school and had been ready for school over a year. He was ready to read and eager to learn. This program was just what he needed, and we are amazed at his progress.

Bad Points:

The only bad point I can think of is that he could not continue in this program next year. I am afraid he might find a regular classroom boring after being able to move as rapidly as he has.

Comments:

As I said before, we are thrilled with the program and would like to see it continued next year.

Signed Mrs. Rodney Jordan

COPY

FRANKLIN SCHOOL

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Martin :

Your child has been enrolled in our experimental "Ungraded" and team-teaching project this year. We would appreciate your reactions to this type of program.

J. C. Hiatt, Principal

Good Points:

Bad Points:

Comments:

Our opinion of this program has not changed. We still highly approve of this program and feel it has been an excellent educational experience for our children.

Signed Mr. & Mrs. Benny Martin

COPY

FRANKLIN SCHOOL

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Mosley :

Your child has been enrolled in our experimental "Ungraded" and team-teaching project this year. We would appreciate your reactions to this type of program.

J. C. Hiatt, Principal

Good Points:

My child has been challenged this year more than before. His rate of progress has been excellent, and he has been so happy in the program.

Bad Points:

Comments:

Signed Mrs. Clinton Mosley

COPY

FRANKLIN SCHOOL

Dear Mr. & Mrs. McMillian :

Your child has been enrolled in our experimental "Ungraded" and team-teaching project this year. We would appreciate your reactions to this type of program.

J. C. Hiatt, Principal

Good Points:

I think this is a wonderful program, and I think the program has helped each child.

Bad Points:

Comments:

I hope the school continues this program.

Signed Mr. & Mrs. Ronald McMillian

We asked our fifth year students to evaluate the team-teaching program. A list of the questions asked are as follows:

1. As a student, do you like the team teaching program?
   Yes _____ No _____
2. What do you like about it?
3. What do you not like about it?

Ninety percent of the responses were favorable. A copy of one of the student's response follows:

Franklin School
1968-1969

Dear Students:

This year you have taken part in the team-teaching program. You have changed rooms in groups and have had different teachers. You also did this last year, and some of you changed rooms and teachers in the third grade.

We wanted to know if you, as a student, like this way of having your classes, or have one teacher and stay in the same room all day and have one teacher teach all subjects.

We would like for each of you to write about this program.

Do you like to have your classes in different rooms and have different teachers?

Yes.

What do you like about it?

I like changing rooms because no two teachers are alike. We can learn more if we change rooms. We also see more of our friends. If you are a little slower in your work or a little faster, there's always a level for you.

Things you do not like.

I like everything.

Signed Lois Ann Hiatt

Teachers Evaluation

Our teachers are one-hundred percent in favor of the project. They are enthusiastic about it, and their comments are favorable. Following are some of their comments:

> "The longer we work in the program, the more we are convinced of the unlimited possibilities it provides. Each success opens up a new door to more exciting ways of providing learning experiences for children."

Some of the benefits teachers have gained from team-teaching are as follows:

1. New teachers have the help and cooperation of experienced teachers.
2. Teachers learn from each other.
3. Teachers have different strengths and weaknesses. By observing each other, the weak teacher will improve in her methods of teaching. We have noted weak teachers becoming strong after working on a team of strong teachers.
4. Teachers in a team share each other's ideas, duties, problems, and materials.
5. Teachers may teach in their strongest subject fields.
6. Teachers are able to do more individualized instruction.
7. The students in this organization have had every opportunity to work according to their ability and interest. They have not felt superior or inferior to any other pupils, since they work on their own level.
8. Our reading center and our reading teachers have enabled our slow readers to make wonderful progress. We can see vast improvement in the reading ability of students that are sent to the center.
9. Teachers counsel with each other in solving disciplining problems.
10. Teacher aides are very helpful.
    - A. Prepare instructional material for the teacher.
    - B. Help with clerical work.
    - C. Assist teachers with housekeeping duties.
    - D. Supervise pupils during the teacher's planning period.
    - E. Give individual help to slower students.
    - F. Supervise pupils during lunch period.

Evaluation of Teacher Aides

The advantages of team-teaching are manifold for teachers, pupils, and aides. Teachers have more planning time and can cover more material. They can devote more time to the child as an individual. They are able to use their talents more wisely and can learn from each other's strengths.

Children benefit greatly in that they can progress at their own rate of speed. They are exposed to the talents of different teachers. If a teacher is weak in a particular subject, and a child does not achieve what he should, this deficiency is remedied by another teacher who is strong in this area.

Teacher aides have a chance to work with children, and are able to use their talents and abilities as the situation warrants. Sometimes, an aide may be able to reach a distressed child more quickly because he doesn't see her as a teacher or disciplinarian, but as a friend.

Teachers' Workshop

The Franklin School Faculty held a five-day workshop at the end of the school year to evaluate our program and to plan for the coming year. Miss Ruth Chadwick, Principal of Horrace Mann School, Newton, Massachusetts, was our leader for two of the days. She particularly stressed the advantages of team teaching and multi-age grouping. The program was very beneficial to our teachers.

Two members of our county staff, Dr. Swanson Richards, Associate Superintendent and Director of the Program, and Mrs. Eva C. Hine, our County Supervisor, met with us for one day of our workshop. The discussion was led by Dr. Richards. He reported on our program and gave us some very encouraging statistics on the reading ability of our pupils. The statistics were taken from the California Achievement Test results. Dr. Richards also spoke on the future trends of education. Mrs. Hine talked to our group on the personal relationship between the teacher and the child. She also reported on the improvement of the reading levels made by our children.

The teachers used the last two days of our workshop to discuss the progress made during the past year and to make plans for the coming year's work. All the teams were enthused about next year's plans. We are planning to have a three-room suite for a team of teachers who will work with a multi-age group of six, seven, and eight year-olds. We also plan to have two centers to work with multi-age group children, seven and eight year-olds. Two-teacher teams will supervise these two centers.

We are pleased with our year's work, and we feel that much progress will be made during the coming year.

Pilot Mountain Elementary School Project

INTRODUCTION

The Title III Project has completed it's second year at our school. We look forward with anticipation to the third year. The progress this year, in some ways, is not as impressive as last but many of the new endeavors started last year have been refined and solidified. Also, there has been much progress in individualizing the instructional program in certain levels of language arts and arithmetic.

Controlled Independent Individualized Reading, Sequentially Individualized Mathematics, and Unit Work which are described below were begun during this year. Controlled Independent Individualized Reading and Sequentially Individualized Mathematics were taken from ideas which were gleaned from other situations and developed into our own local school. Unit Work is our own inovation.

It is our professional opinion that the past year has been very successful. True, many things will need to be changed but our motto is "nothing ventured, nothing learned".

UNIT WORK

It is our belief that work in osical studies, science, and health should be done on a unit basis, therefore we attempted this year for the first time to work entirely by units. A class worked on a unit in social studies and included science and health when possible. After a unit was completed, another unit was started. It could be another unit in social studies or it could be a unit in science with health and social studies included. It is our hope to formulate our own curriculum based on the unit work idea.

SEQUENTIALLY INDIVIDUALIZED MATHEMATICS

Some of our arithmetic was taught by the "Sequentially Individualized Mathematics" program. This program could also be called "contract arithmetic" or "job sheets". It is in the developmental stage and is constantly being refined.

The main idea is to individualize arithmetic, using the current state adopted arithmetic textbook, but allowing each student to proceed at his own rate. The variance within a classroom is becoming as we proceed.

Sequentially Individualized Mathematics is somewhat like the expensive Individualized Program Instruction Program which some schools are using. The program is very time consuming for the teacher, but the teachers who used this process believe that the results overshadow the work.

CONTROLLED INDEPENDENT INDIVIDUAL READING

Controlled Independent Individual Reading at Pilot Mountain was started in the summer of 1968 when we received a number of new paper backs. The company's catalogue was used to determine the grade level of the various books. A college student who was employed for a part of the summer was given the task of "color coding" the books. The books were marked by colored tape on the spine. The actual choosing of the "color code" by grade was done arbitrary as follows: 2nd-blue, 3rd-brown, 4th-yellow, 5th-green, 6th-red, Junior High - white.

We added a number of books during the 68-69 school year and now have over 2,000 books in our Controlled Independent Individual Reading collection. We have at least four books of each title. At first we used more than one copy of a title with a group, but we found through experience that one copy per group gives students a better selection and interest is greater.

Controlled Independent Individual Reading was started with our top 4th year group and from there we branched out. We used pupils to explain the process to new groups and found this to be more satisfactory than teachers.

The question is always asked as to where we got our ideas for the Controlled Independent Individual Reading and we have to be honest and say that we "borrowed" a portion of this program from other schools.

In a class where Controlled Independent Individual Reading is being used you will see children reading in various books. When a student finishes a book he is "checked" to see if he thoroughly read the book, if he understands the content, and if he understands the vocabulary. The checking is done by the teacher for the first person completing a particular book but after that there is a "snowballing" effect and students become checkers.

Questions and vocabulary lists have been developed for each book and a person is checked by being asked the questions and also to give definitions for the words. The number of questions and vocabulary words varies according to the difficulty of the book.

Using Controlled Independent Individual Reading does not free a teacher in any way from the job to be done in reading but it does give help in the process of individualizing reading to the point that every child has the opportunity to have individual instruction.

Perhaps for the first time we have an approach to reading that will stimulate children to read, to improve their vocabulary, but most of all to enjoy.

Parent Reaction

A questionnaire was sent to parents concerning their reaction to the program. The questionnaire was simple and allowed parents to react in their own words. Approximately 503 questionnaires were sent home with children. We had 349 returned. The reactions were, of course, worded differently but the following is a total summary of the responses. Also, it should be noted that many parents reacted in more than one way and that each child carried a questionnaire home therefore there was some duplication of responses. Fifty-eight questionnaires were returned blank or with "No Comment".

Tabulation of reactions considered as favorable:

136 Like ability grouping, levels, progress at own speed.

91 Program helpful and good.

38 Program is O.K.

37 Like different teachers teaching children.

10 Program broadens friendships.

4 Like marking system.

3 Helps to learn better.

2 Like idea of no failure.

2 Children never in another program.

Tabulation of reactions considered as unfavorable:

34 Do not understand marking system.

15 Dislike changing teachers.

14 Too much homework.

12 Just don't understand concept.

7 Do not understand continuous progress.

4 Too much pressure on children.

4 Like old way better.

4 Just don't like.

2 Teachers have no obligations to parents.

2 Dislike individualized arithmetic.

1 Changing classes O.K. but building bad.

1 Some children feel superior.

1 Need to have closer contact with parents.

1 Children not "pushed" enough.

1 Rather have retentions.

1 Not enough individual attention.

1 Still idea of failing because of moving back in groups.

We are well aware of many of the dislikes of parents and the professional staff has the same dislikes. We hope to be able to correct some of these next year.

Student Reaction

There has been a question as to how our children were accepting what we are attempting; therefore, we decided to allow students in our fourth and fifth years to react to the program. The questionnaire was very simple and the directions to the students were as follows:

"TALK TO STUDENTS CONCERNING THEIR REACTION TO PROGRAM:

You know that you have been in an experimental project both this year and last. We, and that includes you, have done some things that are different from what is done in many schools. What I want you to do is to write on the sheet which you have been given your honest reaction to this type program. You do not have to put your name on the sheet, but you may if you like.

There are three places to write on this sheet. There is a place for likes, dislikes, and suggestions. You may not have any likes or dislikes but surely there are some. We would like for you all to make some suggestions.

As I said earlier, we want you to be honest. No one but me will know what is on the sheets and even I will not know who wrote what, so you can be real honest. Please write as plain as you can. If you do not know how to spell a word you want to use, spell it like it sounds and I will figure out what you mean.

Do you have any questions?"

The fifth year results were tabulated and appear on the next page. The fourth year students results were so varied and in many cases vague they were not used for this report but will be used in our thinking for next year.

Many of the "likes" as well as the "dislikes" are quite common to ordinary school situations. In the main the students were very honest in their responses and rather serious about the program. Some of their opinions definitely reflect their parents opinions.

Tabulation of Fifth Year Students' Reactions - Likes:

46 Getting to know more and different teachers.

33 Getting to make new friends.

24 Controlled Independent Individual Reading (Reading Program).

18 Getting to change classes.

17 Pupils can go at own speed.

10 I like everything.

5 Helps to learn more.

5 Likes marking system.

1 Likes teacher.

1 Not too much homework.

1 Changing classes keeps you from getting fat.

1 Likes break in morning.

Dislikes:

25 Dislikes marking system.

17 Dislikes changing classes and teachers.

15 Too much homework.

7 Too much work in Controlled Independent Individual Reading Program.

3 Recess too short.

2 Dislikes all school work.

2 Dislikes having to go to another building.

2 Dislikes keeping up with materials in changing classes.

2 Dislikes walking to other classes.

1 Controlled Independent Individual Reading Program too easy.

1 Parents do not understand program.

1 Dislikes getting up in morning.

Team-Teaching and Team-Planning

The whole category can be summed up very simply. We have been successful in team-planning but our team-teaching has been very limited.

All our teams work well together in planning. One drawback is the buildings that we have to use makes it necessary for some teams to be in entirely different buildings. This problem was largely overcome as was the problem of differences of personalities.

We used true team-teaching in our first year with the low groups for both language arts and arithmetic. This was fairly successful during a part of the year. Another true team-teaching situation was in our arithmetic with our two top groups in the third year. Here we felt we had tremendous success: Fourty-eight children with two teachers in a small room, but all were working individually and successfully.

Most of the professional people who observed our team-teaching situations expressed surprise that we were accomplishing anything with the building facilities which we have.

We have not had team leaders, per se, in the past two years. The feeling of the faculty now seems to be that we do need these leaders and we plan to have them next year.

One problem which we have encountered in team-planning is the lack of sufficient time but we have made some progress on this by using aides and hope to be able to provide teachers more time during the coming year.

Aides

The aides have contributed greatly to our program. The areas and type work they have done has been extremely varied but some of the uses are as follows:

Grading Papers
Getting Supplementary Materials Together
Replacing Teachers in Emergencies
Giving the Teacher a Break
Taking Children to Lunch
With Instruction, Especially with Lower Groups
Relieve Teachers for Planning Time
Keeping School Records
Filing Materials
Duplicating Materials
Typing Units

There were many other jobs that aides did but these seem most important to the teachers. Most of the teachers were very pleased with their aide however it must be said that we had some problems with personality conflicts. These conflicts could occur where ever you have people working together.

We had a rather loose schedule for aides this year and since one was assigned to each year there was a variance in what they contributed to the team. This depended to some extent on the aide but also the teachers determined how successfully the aide was used. Next year we plan to have a rather strict schedule for aides. This schedule will be worked out by the team, teachers and aides, and the principal.

We moved all our aides this year to the next year level so as to have an adult that knew the children in a particular year level. This was successful to some extent but there was a problem in the teacher team adjusting to the new personality. However, it is our opinion that it is better for teachers to have to adjust than it is for children to have to adjust.

Aides need close teacher supervision and can not be expected to replace the teacher. This is rather difficult to get across to some teachers.

It is the opinion of the total professional staff that aides have made our program and as it has been said, "What did we do before we had aides?".

Visitation

Our Visitors

We had one-hundred and twenty-seven professional visitors during the year. This year we took visitors on Tuesdays only and did not start until October 1 and ended April 30th. We had many requests for other dates but we could not honor them. Our teachers liked the idea of one day a week for visitors.

Most of our teachers have become accustomed to visitors and are not bothered; however, it must be said that some teachers will never overcome their anxiety when anyone comes into their classroom. The children did not mind visitors at all. If fact, the pupils usually seemed to enjoy having visitors.

We have had more or less a policy that visitors were to be disregarded by teachers. We now feel visitors should be told to talk with teachers within the classroom as much as they like. This may distract from actual teaching but it may be much more profitable for the visitor.

Our Visits

A majority of our teachers visited other schools during the year. Those that did not visit were given an opportunity but for one reason or another could not go.

We received many excellent ideas from our visits, several of which we are using. Many ideas which are gained in visitations do not actually come out until later when we get what we think is a new idea but is really a remembrance of something we saw before. Some times we can't remember where.

The professional staff feels that visiting other schools has been a tremendous help to us, if for nothing else than to make us realize that other people have problems just as we have.

We also found that it was helpful for teachers in our school to visit other levels and with other teachers. This probably gave us some degree of patience with our co-workers.

Consultants and In-Service Courses

One consultant we had, Miss Ruth Chadwick, was worth her weight in gold. However, most of our teachers seem to feel that many consultants and in-service courses were not "worth the effort". This is really not a reflection in any way on the consultants or in-service participants. It can simply be stated that our professional personnel realize that there is so much to do and so little time that every minute counts.

We believe that consultants can be of value but they often can not be obtained at the particular time they are needed or in the particular area wanted. We feel that we can use our own local people to advantage in many areas. Many consultants and in-service courses are really not practical for our local situation.

As has often been said, "What will work in one place may not work in Pilot Mountain or some other place".

Additional Materials

Our Title III Project has given us additional materials and we have bought much from local funds. These additional materials have been very helpful. We believe that it is important to "take stock" often as to what we have and how we are using what we have. There is, of necessity, some duplication of materials bought. It is impossible to always disperse all materials as they should be. Perhaps lack of use would be a better term than duplication.

Perhaps the biggest help that additional materials have given us is in our Controlled Independent Individual Reading Program which is described elsewhere in this report. We have been able to buy many small items from time to time which enrich our program and which are not normally available.

Additional materials have broadened our instructional program and enabled us to reach many children that we would not have been able to reach otherwise.

Attitude and Achievement

Test results show to some extent the achievement progress of the children in the ungraded project but much of the true achievement and changes of attitudes are not shown. Much of this progress is strictly conjecture on the part of teachers but many years of experience does give them license to an opinion.

A teacher who was new to our program but was a veteran teacher summed it up as follows:

> "In this program, I feel the child is considered more on an individual basis than in a graded program. He is allowed to work on the level of material he is capable of doing and can achieve success at his own rate of speed. The child appears happier in his school work when he does well on his work. For instance, if the slow child can make a good grade (perhaps even a hundred) on a paper, he beams with joy and tries to do well the next time. He is not always doomed with 'I always fail, what's the use to try'."

"I think the child who does work which is above the group he is in should be sent to the next group during the year, not at the end of school. I recommended several students for other groups this year and they were moved during the year. I was particularly interested in these children's progress so I tried to keep up with them. I taught some of these children again later in the year and found they had done remarkable well. One girl had advanced well ahead of some others who had been in the group all year. All of them certainly came up to my expectations."

"Several new students came in and we were not sure which group they would work best in. Some were changed during the year to a lower group. I taught some of these students later in the year and found their work improved in the lower group."

One of our more capable young teachers made the following observations about three of her students:

"Jimmy--Since I taught the 4th last year I became acquainted with Jimmy then. He was a child who was very withdrawn, unhappy, and a very poor worker. Could not even read primer material with ease. At the end of this year, I had Jimmy again in my 3-1 reading class (Jimmy's a 5th year student). I could see remarkable improvement in his attitude and his performance and cooperation. He is still just reading on a 2nd year level, but he enjoys reading and is not nervous about it. He responds well and that is an accomplishment in itself because for the first few months of last year he sat with a coat over his head. The home situation is poor and from all indications it has worsened. Therefore, this school must be credited with helping Jimmy."

"Jay--Jay was a real problem in school at the beginning of this year (3-4). I moved him from 3-4 to 3-3 and later, after a conference with his mother and all of us working, he has moved back to 3-4 and showed marked improvement in his work and attitude."

"Bob--Bob is an exceptional child in math. By being in Sequentially Individualized Mathematics he moved at his own rate. He could not wait until time for math."

We feel that all our children are developing a sense of self reliance in this program. True, we are trying to give more individual attention and help but at the same time children are becoming aware of the necessity of their doing many things on their own.

Some children still say they dislike school but that is the popular thing to say and they will say that forever. Perhaps we have pushed some children to hard in the academic subjects but we do know that we have made progress.

There are definite indications that the range of achievement, even with young children, has increased and we sincerely hope that we have raised even the lowest child.

Test Data

As a means of evaluating the Title III Project children, the California Achievement Test was administered in the spring to all students attending the school for two, three, or four years. The California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity was given in November for grade level 2. Mental Maturity scores for grades 3 and 4 were obtained by last years test of Mental Maturity. Means and Standard Deviations were computed for both schools included in the project. The report of the test data does not include any scores for individual schools. Test results and comparisons are included in the report and inferences can be made by the reader.

Table I shows results of the "California Short-Form Test of Mental Ability". As can be noted in Table I the mean I.Q. as measured by the test administered is below the National Norm of 100 only on level 3. At level 2 the mean is slightly above the national norm and at level 4 it is approximately on the national norm. The standard deviation is slightly lower in all three levels then the test norm of 16 and would indicate a lesser range of academic ability.

TABLE I

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS BY LEVELS ON THE
"CALIFORNIA SHORT-FORM TEST OF MENTAL MATURITY"
Administered in November, 1968 for Level 2
Administered in November, 1967 for Level 3 and 4

Level	Number Tested	Means	S.D.
Level 2	263	102.88	14.72
Level 3	251	95.95	14.10
Level 4	260	100.70	13.65

Table II shows the results of achievement tests administered after children have completed 2, 3, and 4 years in this project. The achievement test was administered during the 8th month of school.

TABLE II

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS BY SUB-TEST AND LEVELS
AS MEASURED BY THE "CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST"
Administered in the Spring of 1969

	Means			S.D.		
	2nd Level	3rd Level	4th Level	2nd Level	3rd Level	4th Level
Reading	3.24	3.79	5.21	.74	.65	1.36
Arithmetic	3.51	3.98	5.38	.79	.59	1.21
Language	3.25	3.82	5.30	.86	.57	1.38
Total Battery	3.40	3.88	5.24	.68	.59	1.22

Table III is a comparison of achievement scores for grade levels three and four. No comparison was possible with level two as there was no pre-test.

TABLE III

Pre-Post (Spring 1968 and Spring 1969) Test comparisons on ungraded classes at Franklin and Pilot Mountain Elementary Schools as measured by the "California Achievement Test".

SECOND LEVEL PRE-POST COMPARISON
No Comparison Scores for Year 1968

	Means			S.D.	
	1968	1969	Difference	1968	1969
Reading		3.24			.74
Arithmetic		3.51			.79
Language		3.25			.86
Total Battery		3.40			.68

THIRD LEVEL PRE-POST COMPARISON

	Means 1968	Means 1969	Difference	S.D. 1968	S.D. 1969
Reading	3.17	3.79	.62	.83	.65
Arithmetic	3.33	3.98	.65	.84	.59
Language	3.12	3.82	.70	.92	.57
Total Battery	3.23	3.88	.65	.80	.59

FOURTH LEVEL PRE-POST COMPARISON

	Means 1968	Means 1969	Difference	S.D. 1968	S.D. 1969
Reading	3.97	5.21	1.24	.99	1.36
Arithmetic	4.12	5.38	1.26	.78	1.21
Language	3.97	5.30	1.33	1.01	1.38
Total Battery	4.08	5.24	1.16	.87	1.22

Summary

The evaluation of a project of this scope and nature cannot be delivered in such a way that all aspects are covered. We have tried to give you an insight into this project from the administrators, teachers, parents, and the students. There have been good and bad points listed, there have been weak and strong points, but the general overall summation is that the program is a success. The esteem that this program has held with people in this area and with people throughout the state is evidenced by the long list of visitors that have spent time this year at the schools of Franklin and Pilot Mountain.

VISITORS TO FRANKLIN SCHOOL

1968 - 1969

NAME	ADDRESS	POSITION
Ruth E. Raabe	Hillsville, Va.	General Supervisor of Carroll County Schools
Beulah Quesinberry	Hillsville, Va.	Title III Director Carroll County Schools
Diane Pulliam	Hillsville, Va.	Title I Reading Co-ordinator Carroll County Schools
Owen Bowman	Lambsburg, Va.	Language Arts Coordinator Carroll County Schools
John W. Cooper	Hillsville, Va.	Co-ordinator of Science and Mathematics - Carroll County Schools
Mildred Taylor	Sparta, N. C.	Teacher
Hazel Tomplins	Sparta, N. C.	Teacher
Donna Jones	Sparta, N. C.	Supervisor of Alleghany County Schools
John H. Miller	Sparta, N. C.	Principal, Sparta Elem.
Myrtle I. Gollehon	White Plains, N. C.	Teacher
Benny Martin	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Dr. Karl W. Yungling	306 Beech Road Butler, Pa.	Director Title III
Frances Mooney	Rt. 2, Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Vera C. Smith	Rt. 1, Westfield, N. C.	Teacher
Ethel H. Christian	Rt. 1, Westfield, N. C.	Teacher
Grace Chilton	Rt. 1, Ararat, N. C.	Teacher
Joyce Fulk	Rt. 2, Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Patty Norman	Rt. 2, Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Mrs. Newell Baker	P. O. Box 746 Pilot Mountain, N. C.	Teacher
Brenda Davis	Rt. 7, Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher

NAME	ADDRESS	POSITION
Evelyn Phipps	Piney Creek School, N.C.	Teacher
Evelyn M. Hash	Sparta, N. C.	Teacher
Ethel B. Taylor	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Mary S. Jones	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Mrs. Finley P. Hodges	Boone, N. C.	Teacher
Mary Good Tilley	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Mrs. Fred Goins, Jr.	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
K. Virginia Galloway	501 N. South Street Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Estelle W. Baber	331 Country Club Road Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
B. Madge Jones	Box 116, Toast, N. C.	Teacher
Leila Voris	1641 Locklear Street Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Sara F. Reid	249 S. Main Street Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Lelia Hodges	549, Mount Airy, N.C.	Teacher
Emma G. Edwards	710 Rockford Street Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Alice Mae Ward	Lambsburg, Va.	Teacher
Margaret H. Leonard	Ararat, Va.	Principal
Linda U. Beeson	Fancy Gap, Va.	Teacher
Cassie M. Clowers	Dugspur, Va.	Teacher
Jerry Richardson	Fancy Gap, Va.	Teacher
Flossie Largen	Dugspur, Va.	Teacher
Iva Lea Easter	Fancy Gap, Va.	Teacher
Ethel Wilson	Ararat, Va.	Teacher
Virginia Hiatt	Ararat, Va.	Principal
Elva B. Neal	407 Brentwood Drive Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher

NAME	ADDRESS	POSITION
Patricia Q. Hartsock	Route #5, Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Phillip Berrier	Route #5, Mount Airy, N.C.	Teacher
Owen Bowman	Lambsburg, Va.	Stimulating Director of Title III
Ruth Hanes	State Road, N. C.	Teacher
Dovie W. Cude	Rt. #1, Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Beverly Lawrence	Elkin, N. C.	Teacher
Lois S. Reinhardt	Elkin, N. C.	Teacher
Joan Nolan	Elkin, N. C.	Teacher
Marguerite B. Mann	Elkin, N. C.	Teacher
J. Clyde Phillips	Jonesville, N. C.	Principal
Carolyne H. Badgett	Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Myrtle Moore	Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Nell A. Folger	Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Edythe F. Reece	Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Pat J. Everette	Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Camilla W. Cook	Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Elizabeth F. Bolich	Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Blanche Folger	Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Maxie G. Stoneman	Hillsville, Va.	Teacher
Ninevah J. Willis	Laurel Fork, Va.	Teacher
Madalene Smythers	Woodlawn, Va.	Teacher
Maudleena H. Cochran	Galax, Va.	Teacher
Joe B. Maye	Hillsville, Va.	Teacher
Jean Foy	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Phyllis Caviniss	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Carolyn McCarther	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Maggie S. Hiatt	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher

NAME	ADDRESS	POSITION
Doris Timmons	White Plains, N. C.	Teacher
Jean Bryant	1349 Gwynwood Drive Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Vera S. Cockerham	Flat Rock School Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Geraldine I. Jones	Flat Rock School Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Judy Blackburn	C. B. Eller School Wilkes County Schools	Teacher
Zoba Phillips	C. B. Eller School Wilkes County Schools	Teacher
Lucille Edwards	Laurel School Carroll County Schools	Teacher
Edith Semones	Hillsville, Va. Carroll County Schools	Teacher
Lila Shepherd	Hillsville, Va. Carroll County Schools	Teacher
Mary Margaret Lowe	201 W. Virginia Street Galax, Va.	Teacher
Ada B. Hundley	Hillsville, Va.	Teacher
Loue W. Cox	Box 31, Hillsville, Va.	Teacher
James Burwell	Box 81, Hillsville, Va.	Principal
Sue Robertson	Millers Creek School	Teacher
Linda Shore	Millers Creek School	Teacher
Loretta Eller	Millers Creek School	Teacher
Roger Jackson	Wilkes County Schools Wilkesboro, N. C.	Director of Title III Project
Roger A. Schurrer	Raleigh, N. C.	N. C. Department of Public Instruction
John H. O'Connell	Raleigh, N. C.	N. C. Department of Public Instruction
Reid Pullman	Lexington, N. C.	Teacher
Dr. Lester Ball	UNC at Chapel Hill	Professor

NAME	ADDRESS	POSITION
Grace C. Efird	Winston-Salem,Forsyth County Schools	Supervisor
Minnie Ruth Gentry	Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Martha B. Graham	Rt. #2, Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Mary M. Freeman	Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Naomi Parks	Roaring River, N. C.	Teacher
Elizabeth P. Allen	Wilkesboro, N. C.	Teacher
Mary Gladys Gentry	Elkin, N. C.	Teacher
Denver Holcomb	Elkin, N. C.	Principal
Eva J. Jeffries	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Charmin H. Baity	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Thelma S. Moore	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Hattie N. Ingram	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Myra Hannah	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Barbara Manning	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Grace Samuel	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Margaret V. Alexander	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Dorothy Carmichael	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Winston-Salem, Forsyth County Supervisor
Rachel Younger	Elon College, N. C.	Teacher
Carol Leffers	Elon College, N. C.	Teacher
Blanche Marshall	White Plains, N. C.	Teacher
Roberta Isaacs	White Plains, N. C.	Teacher
Bronnie M. Harris	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Doris B. Brown	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Nora Scales	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Mildred Payne	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Mary W. Reynolds	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher

NAME	ADDRESS	POSITION
Carolyn W. Coleman	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Rubie B. Gilbert	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Marie A. Matthews	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Shirley J. Perry	Winston-Salem, N. C.	Teacher
Mary Lou Midkiff	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Nita Eubanks	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Bobby Timmons	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Kathryn Mays	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Billy Ray Hiatt	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Annette Ayers	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Dorothy Smith	Ararat, Va.	Teacher
Peggy Johnson	Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Joseph N. Gollehon	White Plains, N. C.	Teacher
Louise Kendall	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Thomas H. Houck	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Gaye Martin	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Charles Wagoner	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
James Jessup	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Herman R. Griffin	Pilot Mountain, N. C.	Principal
Dr. Swanson Richards	Dobson, N. C.	Director of Title III Project
Eva C. Hine	Jonesville, N. C.	Supervisor
Creola Phillips	Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Sharon B. Barnette	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Betty R. Daniels	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Mary F. Hodges	Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Evelyn Howie	Dobson, N. C.	Teacher
Sandra E. Reid	Dobson, N. C.	Teacher

NAME	ADDRESS	POSITION
Juanita Draughn	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Shirley Brown	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
Ruth Hawks	Mount Airy, N. C.	Teacher
D. J. O'Dell	Mount Airy, N. C.	P.T.A. President
Joe Hall	Toast, N. C.	School Committee Member
Moir Carter	Mount Airy, N. C.	School Committee Member
Gerold Collins	Mount Airy, N. C.	School Committee Member
Roy Kirkman	Mount Airy, N. C.	School Committee Member
Arlyes McCraw	Mount Airy, N. C.	School Committee Member
J. Sam Gentry	Dobson, N. C.	Superintendent
Clinton Moseley	Mount Airy, N. C.	Member of Surry County School Board

VISITORS TO PILOT MOUNTAIN SCHOOL

1968 - 1969

Wilkes County Schools	3 groups
North Wilkesboro City Schools	
Burlington-Alamance County	2 groups
Elkin City Schools	
Rowan County Schools	2 groups
University of North Carolina	
Moore County Schools	3 groups
Stokes County Schools	2 groups
Lexington City Schools	
N. C. Department of Public Instruction	2 groups
Newton, Massachusetts	
Yadkin County Schools	2 groups
McDowell County Schools	
Marion City Schools	
Mount Airy City Schools	
Surry County Schools	3 groups